A U M

There is one Eternal Thinker thinking non-eternal thoughts; He, though one, fulfils the desires of many. The wise, who perceive Him within their self, to them belong eternal life, eternal peace.

—*Upanishads*

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 64 JULY, 1976 NUMBER 9

TIMELY AWAKENING

IN his *Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita,* Mr. Judge spoke of the rampant individualism which has come with the unfolding of the dark age of Kali Yuga, remarking that while in Europe this emphasis on the personal idea has been somewhat tempered by traditions of hierarchical order, "in America, being totally unrestrained, and forming in fact the basis of independence here, it has culminated." He continues:

> Its bad effects—vaguely as yet shadowing the horizon—might have been avoided if the doctrines of the Wisdom-Religion had been also believed in by the founders of the republic. And so, after the sweeping away of the fetters forged by priestly dogma and kingly rule, we find springing up a superstition far worse than that which we have been used to call by the name. It is the superstition of materialism that bows down to a science which leads only to a negation.

It is fitting, in the month which marks observance of the bicentennial anniversary of the founding of the United States, to consider what changes, if any, have occurred in the "American" outlook. The confirmation of what Mr. Judge implies as a part of American destiny—only vaguely "shadowing the horizon" in his time—hardly needs pointing out. Today the critics of "materialism" and of the selfish misuse of power are legion. But is there any evidence of a new spirit abroad in the land? Are there indications that the idea of brotherhood—the key conception and practical goal of the Wisdom-Religion—is at last gaining currency in the thought of the American people?

Happily, there are positive answers to this question. Encouraging signs are many. They range from musing criticism of the acquisitive temper of business, the exploitive habits of industry, and the almost universal attack on the natural environment, to deeply wondering questions about the possibility of a higher reality behind the personal self, of a better use of the mind than mere technical calculation, and, finally, to an open endeavor to revive ancient ideas about the bonds of fraternity among mankind. A current example of serious concern with this last ideal—of such paramount importance—is found in a work published recently by the University of California Press—*The Idea of Fraternity in America.*

The author is Wilson Carey McWilliams, a professor of political Science at Rutgers University. In this book the writer combines exhaustive scholarship with a measured yet quietly ardent appeal for the restoration of the spirit of fraternity to American life. In a passage dealing with the ways in which devotion to individualism displaced the ideal of brotherhood in America's cultural inheritance, Professor McWilliams notes the emphasis on self-interest in America's basic law. He writes:

> The "system" is not a "value-neutral" set of techniques; the Framers would have been offended at the mere suggestion. Our public institutions have been based on the assumptions and theories of the liberal Enlightenment. Law contains a bias toward individualism, a hostility to communities, an assumption that material well-being and technological advance are in the high interests of man. (Almost the only positive aim set forth in Article I of the Constitution is the "Progress of science and the useful arts.") In this sense, "working within the system" has weakened the strength of the informal and religious tradition, as opposed to the formally established and "rational" doctrines of modernity.
>
> Nowhere is this more vital than in relation to "fraternity," an idea common to both the Enlightenment and the religious tradition which touches the most delicate point of distinction between them. The traditions differ on the nature of fraternity, and the paternity which is its basis, because they differ on the nature of man. That first principle is, in relation to fraternity, immediately relevant in the relations and conduct of men; it cannot be dispensed with as a "metaphysical" question irrelevant to conduct.

The "relevance" of such observations to the platform and objects of the Theosophical movement seems quite apparent.

Prof. McWilliams continues:

> Whatever may be thought of the liberal idea of fraternity, the liberal tradition proposed to discard fraternity as a means to human perfection and a norm in everyday political and social life. . . . The goal of a universal fraternity, or at least a fraternal society, is the bribe which progress offers to tradition. Yet the ideas of fraternity and fraternal society characteristic of the religious tradition, when seen clearly, clash with those of the liberal tradition. . . . The ability of "progress" to harmonize religious and Enlightenment ethics depends upon the ability to obscure the ultimate aim, allowing men to close their eyes to the fact that the goals differ, and the paths with them, and that what is progress toward one becomes, after a certain crossroads, retrogression from the other.

In his conclusion to this section, the writer gives his idea of what needs to be done:

> If direction rather than drift is to be possible, if clarity about values—to say nothing of change in them—is to be conceivable, a leadership is needed to remind men forcefully of what they do, and possibly teach them better. Religious groups, though their performance has been spotty, have sometimes performed that service, and religious men have often done so grandly. Philosophers and intellectuals, captivated by the charms of modern philosophy and modern pelf, have done far less. Perhaps the greatest service for the old tradition was performed by novelists, poets, and tellers of tales, who kept its ideals alive when the influence of Scripture waned and the old philosophies ceased to move men. Sometimes, too, political men and statesmen, whom the proud scientism of the Enlightenment sought to displace, performed similar tasks in the struggle to retain as much as might be of the idea of fraternity and the vision of the city. Those who would accept a similar duty in the unpromising present would be well advised to seek inspiration and wisdom in their example.

Professor McWilliams' perception of the need of the age recalls, in a general way, H.P.B.'s article, "The Tidal Wave." One need only add the resources of inspiration she provided to make the parallel a suggestive one indeed.

SPIRIT AND MATTER

> This [monadic] evolution—viewed from its several standpoints—*i.e.*, as the *universal* and the *individualized* Monad; and the chief aspects of the Evolving Energy, after differentiation —the purely Spiritual, the Intellectual, the Psychic and the Physical—may be thus formulated as an invariable law; a descent of Spirit into Matter, equivalent to an ascent in physical evolution; a re-ascent from the depths of materiality towards its *status quo ante*, with a corresponding dissipation of concrete form and substance up to the LAYA state, or what Science calls "the zero-point," and beyond. . . .
>
> Physical Science having now ascertained, through its department of Chemistry, the invariable law of this evolution of atoms . . . cannot well reject the same as a general law. And once it is forced by its enemies—Metaphysics and Psychology [here *Spiritual* psychology is meant]—out of its impregnable strongholds, it will find it more difficult than it now appears to refuse room *in the Spaces* of SPACE to Planetary Spirits (gods), Elementals, and even the *Elementary* Spooks or Ghosts, and others. Already . . . two Positivists and Materialists, have succumbed before this logical necessity. Other and still greater Scientists will follow in that "intellectual FALL." They will be driven out of their position not by spiritual, theosophical, or any other physical or even mental phenomena, but simply by the enormous *gaps* and *chasms* that open daily and will still be opening before them, as one discovery follows the other, until they are finally knocked off their feet by the ninth wave of simple common sense.
>
> —*The Secret Doctrine* I, 620

THE language of modern physics—its words, to say nothing of the concepts which they represent—has developed from sources very different from that on which *The Secret Doctrine* is based, and there has been considerable change in the key ideas of physical science since 1888, when H.P.B.'s major work was published. Students of Theosophy sometimes wish they were able to translate the ideas of the Secret Doctrine into the terms of modern physics, simply in order to obtain a better grasp of the relations between occult and physical science, but find attempts

in this direction difficult and unsatisfactory in result. Of late, however, there have been changes in the thinking of scientists which may make such efforts seem less important. For example, a recently published volume, *The Nature of Scientific Discovery* (Smithsonian Institution Press, 1975), commemorating the 500th anniversary of the birth of Copernicus, contains essays which led a reviewer in *Science* (March 19) to call this work "unexpected and remarkable." He quotes from the late physicist, Werner Heisenberg, the declaration that the time has come to "abandon the 2500-year old tradition extending from the time of Democritos that leads physicists to search for the fundamental elementary particle." Heisenberg's musings might easily qualify as a response to a "ninth wave of simple common sense." This leading theoretical physicist of our time says in his contribution to the Smithsonian volume:

> Even if quarks could be found, for all we know they could again be divided into two quarks and one antiquark, etc., and thus they would not be more elementary than a proton. . . . We will have to abandon the philosophy of Democritos and the concept of fundamental elementary particles. We should accept instead the concept of fundamental symmetries, which is a concept out of the philosophy of Plato.

Commenting on Heisenberg's essay, and on the contribution by the astronomer, John Wheeler, the *Science* writer, who is himself an astronomer, observes that these present views "raise the entire problem of knowledge and of the relation of man to the universe in an acute sense." Both the world of physics and the nature of human understanding of the external world, he says, "have quite suddenly moved to a crisis." He continues:

> Apparently our observations of the universe today imply that in the beginning was a single entity of infinitesimal dimensions to which the application of quantum theory is inadmissible. Further, the homogeneity and the number of particles and the forces between them in the embryonic universe narrowly determined that galaxies, stars, and eventually life could evolve in the universe. Are physics and astronomy returning us to a belief in the partnership of the mind of man in the foundation of the universe? It is a question asked and debated in this volume. . . .
>
> Where lies the foundation of ethics? Is ethics created by man for the sake of survival, or is there a fundamental ethic in our existence in the universe? . . . One ends this volume with these questions uppermost and with a feeling of entreaty

and hope that man will survive so that the genius of a future Copernicus can penetrate the heart of darkness.

While it may be many years before the concepts of physics in any way approximate the formulations of occult dynamics, the door is at least open to another sort of inquiry. And there is a vague common ground in the idea that "mind" may play a part in the foundation of the universe, since the Theosophical cosmology regards the universe as essentially an expression of Mind, and its definitions originate in what H.P.B. terms spiritual psychology, rather than attempts to reduce all matter and existence to some common denominator of atomic or nuclear substance.

In the scientific analysis, matter seems to dissolve into energy. In Theosophy it dissolves into idea. There is this fundamental statement in *The Secret Doctrine*:

> When "the one becomes two," it may then be referred to as Spirit *and* matter. To "Spirit" is referable every manifestation of consciousness, reflective or direct. . . . "Matter" must be regarded as objectivity in its purest abstraction—the self-existing basis whose septenary manvantaric differentiations constitute the objective reality underlying the phenomena of each phase of conscious existence. . . .
>
> There can be no manifestation of Consciousness, semi-consciousness, or even "unconscious purposiveness," except through the vehicle of matter; that is to say, on this our plane, wherein human consciousness *in its normal state* cannot soar beyond what is known as transcendental metaphysics, it is only through some molecular aggregation or fabric that Spirit wells up in a stream of individual or sub-conscious subjectivity. And as Matter existing apart from perception is a mere abstraction, both of these aspects of the ABSOLUTE—Cosmic Substance and Cosmic Ideation—are mutually inter-dependent. In strict accuracy—to avoid confusion and misconception—the term "Matter" ought to be applied to the aggregate of objects of possible perception, and "Substance" to *noumena;* for inasmuch as the phenomena of *our* plane are the creation of the perceiving Ego —the modifications of its own subjectivity—all the "states of matter representing the aggregate of perceived objects" can have but a relative and purely phenomenal existence for the children of our plane. (I, 327-29.)

This passage, while psychologically enlightening, presents certain difficulties to the twentieth-century mind. Haunting the reader while he follows its logic is the question, "Yes, but what is matter *in itself?*" Granted that the organs of perception used to inspect the visible world will determine its appearance, but surely, under-

neath the configurations which we impose on matter by looking at it, "something" is nonetheless there. No doubt there is an answer to this question. *The Secret Doctrine* suggests as much in using the Kantian phrase, *"things in themselves,"* the question being whether so abstract a conception—an idea of "transcendental metaphysics" —will supply the intellectual security or satisfaction we seek. In every one of us there is a stubborn Dr. Johnson wanting to exclaim that the objective cobblestone we stumble over is *real,* and not just an image produced in our own or even the cosmic mind.

Yet we are given only a mind-stretching philosophic reply:

> The pure object apart from consciousness is unknown to us, while living on the plane of our three-dimensional World; as we know only the mental states it excites in the perceiving Ego. And, so long as the contrast of Subject and Object endures—to wit, as long as we enjoy our five senses and no more, and do not know how to divorce our all-perceiving *Ego* (the Higher Self) from the thraldom of these senses—so long will it be impossible for the *personal* Ego to break through the barrier which separates it from a knowledge of *things in themselves* (*or Substance*). (*S.D.* I, 329-30.)

Until recently, this explanation left many readers with feelings of puzzlement, since most scientists (not all) were talking about matter as though they knew what the word meant. And even if the senses are to be regarded as barriers to *seeing* the substratum of the physical world, one still may long for an account of what the *prima materia* is like. It is as though some comforting idea of *reality* is wanted—something corresponding to the familiar scientific expression, "fundamental elementary particles." And while the scientists—as represented by Werner Heisenberg—now declare that the quest for such "particles" is futile, and speak of "symmetries" instead, there should be value in attempting to understand the common desire to obtain a simple, working definition of Matter.

It may be useful to draw back from this question for a moment, and to ask what indeed is the foundation of manifested reality? In Theosophy we are at once confronted by primordial duality—the poles of Cosmic Ideation and Cosmic Substance, neither of which has meaning apart from the other. The attempt to say something about Idea without implying substance, or of Substance without idea, eliminates what is to be referred to from the universe of rational discourse. Matter, in short, cannot be independently

defined in terms of itself. And spirit, or idea, cannot conceive definitions without some matter to work with. The matter which is "self-existent" is noumenal substance—reunited with Spirit—and we are virtually unable to talk about that; nor, if we could, would what we might say satisfy the terms of our longing. When we ask what is "fundamental" about matter, the object of the inquiry turns into something which is not matter at all. Thus matter is ultimately inseparable from spirit, and we can have neither finality nor security in definitions constructed from the "givens" of this plane.

We encounter, in short, some sort of "Ring-Pass Not" in every attempt to make matter intelligible in the matter-of-fact way in which the scientists are accustomed to speak, listing the "elements" and diagramming the sub-atomic particles.

Must we be content, then, with a universe which has dissolved into a psychological mist? The pejorative terms of the question have some significance. One might turn the question about, asking the materialist if he can continue to be content with a universe that has no intelligence in it—that is governed by chance, its parts manipulated by blind forces inaccessible to orderly understanding and moral preference. The materialist may demur. He may insist that the purity of his conception will be violated if he permits the invasion of his theory by subjective factors which are not only unobservable by the senses but unpredictable in terms originating causes. We may find this answer unsatisfactory, but equally unsatisfactory is any attempt to define matter apart from precisely those subjective factors on which all manifestation depends.

Such considerations may make less bewildering the discovery that in occult literature the word "Elements" refers sometimes to visible, physical elements, and sometimes to "the spiritual, intelligent Potencies—Angels and Demons in their Manvantaric form." (*S.D.* I, 373 fn.) In our conceptual vocabulary, these two are as far apart as can be, but in the language of occultism, it seems, they are closely linked. Moreover, the elements of which the chemists used to speak are really only passing phenomena, we are told. Referring to the Archaic Stanzas, H.P.B. says: "A great number of names referring to chemical substances and other compounds, which have now ceased to combine together, and are therefore unknown to the later offshoots of our Fifth Race, occupy

a considerable space." She adds: "As they are simply untranslateable, and would remain in every case inexplicable, they are omitted, along with those which cannot be made public." (*S.D.* I, 478.) In occultism, atoms are not only matter, but also souls—atom-Souls, as *The Secret Doctrine* puts it.

What is called for, for practical purposes, in thinking about these things is to begin to regard *consciousness and thought* as the primary reality behind manifested existence, and then to recognize in matter the images presented to our senses by the forms in which various levels of life and intelligence are embodied. In the section, "On the Elements and Atoms," the teaching is given in these words:

> Modern physics, while borrowing from the ancients their atomic theory, forgot one point, the most important of the doctrine; hence they got only the husks and will never be able to get at the kernel. They left behind, in the adoption of physical atoms, the suggestive fact that from Anaxagoras down to Epicurus, the Roman Lucretius, and finally even to Galileo, all those Philosophers believed more or less in ANIMATED atoms, not in invisible specks of so-called "brute" matter. . . . The idea was metaphysical as well as physical; the hidden interpretation embracing "gods" or souls, in the shape of atoms, as the *causes* of all the *effects* produced on Earth by the *secretions* from the divine bodies. No ancient philosopher, not even the Jewish Kabalists, ever dissociated Spirit from matter or *vice versa*. (*S.D.* I, 567-8.)

H.P.B.'s unwillingness to identify atoms or elements in any but philosophic terms has this decisive explanation: "The atom belongs wholly to the domain of metaphysics. It is *an entified abstraction*—at any rate for physical Science—and has nought to do with physics, strictly speaking, as it can never be brought to the test of retort or balance." (*S.D.* I, 513.) Further: "It is on the doctrine of the illusive nature of matter, and the infinite divisibility of the atom, that the whole science of Occultism is built." (*S.D.* I, 520.) Primordial matter is eternal, while atoms are born in every new Manvantara, and each of these atoms has in it the potentiality of self-consciousness—being at once an atom and an angel! (*S.D.* I, 107.)

From these statements one sees the necessity for defining atoms by their animating principles, since "every physical particle corresponds to and depends on its higher *noumenon*—the Being to whose essence it belongs." (*S.D.* I, 218 fn.)

Is there, then, no possibility of converting the occult account of matter into the language of physics? Not, apparently, by studying or considering matter in itself, since it is indeed "no thing" in itself. In Vol. II of *The Secret Doctrine* (106) H.P.B. observes that the Elements of the ancients—"especially fire, water, and air—are made the progenitors of our *five physical senses,* and hence are directly connected (in an occult way) with them." Then, after speaking of the Secondary Creation described in the Puranas, she adds a note:

> The opponents of Hinduism may call the above Pantheism, Polytheism, or anything they may please. If Science is not entirely blinded by prejudice, it will see in this account a profound knowledge of *natural Sciences and Physics,* as well as of Metaphysics and Psychology. But to find this out, one has to study the personifications, and then convert them into chemical atoms. It will then be found to satisfy both physical and even purely materialistic *Science,* as well as those who see in evolution the work of the "Great Unknown Cause" in its phenomenal and illusive aspects. (*S.D.* II, 107 fn.)

The root of the question is indeed psychological. Such problems arising from the study of occult philosophy are closely connected with the particular notions and feelings about "reality" which are in the foreground of human thought at a given time. A comment by Mr. Judge, printed in the *Path* (November, 1894) under the heading, "Wrong Popular Notions," gives very nearly all the explanation needed:

> The atom and the molecule are very influential words. They are constantly used by people claiming to follow science, but who indulge in criticisms on the uncertainties of Theosophical speculation. Yet no one ever saw an atom or a molecule. They are accepted as facts by science—just as the spiritually-inclined accept the existence of the invisible soul—yet it is impossible to objectively prove either the one or the other. They are deemed to be proven because they are necessary. But let a Theosophist say that the astral body exists, and Mahatmas also, because both are necessary in evolution, and at once a demand arises for "demonstration" by objective proofs.

Each century or historical epoch has its key assumptions of "necessity" and its key rejections and denials. Reflection on these psychological foci might throw more light on the mystery of matter and its states than any other sort of investigation.

DEVACHAN

WESTERN STRICTURE AND EASTERN VERSION

[The sixth installment of the series, "Fragments of Occult Truth," which appeared in the *Theosophist* for March, 1883 (reprinted in THEOSOPHY 2:350), drew criticism from a British Theosophist who maintained that the account given of the Devachanic condition was either inadequate or described a "cheat" by nature, in that there seemed to be no true intercourse between souls in this after-death state, but only an imagined or "dreamed" relationship. The reader's comment and objections were provided at some length in a memorandum which H.P.B. printed in the *Theosophist* for August, 1883, followed by three Replies which, she said, came "from three different sources." These Replies bear internal evidence of the august character of their origin. They are now reprinted here, in three parts.—Eds., THEOSOPHY.]

THE REAL AND THE UNREAL

REPLY I

The perfect consciousness that "I am Brahma"
Removes the false appearances projected
By Ignorance. . . . Know that indeed as Brahma—
Nothing exists but Brahma, when aught else
Appears to be 'tis like the mirage false. . . .

—*Atma-bodha* (Knowledge of Soul)

SANKARACHARYA

THE "misunderstanding" arises from a natural misconception of the sense in which certain terms are made use of rather than from any "inconsistent language" used. The alternatives of moving for ever in a vicious circle faces the European student of Occult philosophy, who begins his study before having made himself familiar with the technical mode of thought and peculiarity of expression of its teachers. His first necessity is, to know the esoteric views of the ultimate nature of Spirit, of Matter, Force and Space; the fundamental and axiomatic theories as to the Reality and Unreality, Form and the Formless (*rupa* and *a-rupa*), dream and waking.[1] Especially should he master—

[1] The Vedanta philosophy teaches as much as Occult philosophy that our *monad* during its life on earth as a *triad* (7th, 6th, and 5th principles), has, besides the condition of pure intelligence, three conditions; namely, waking, dreaming, and *sushupti*—a state of *dreamless* sleep—from the stand-point of terrestrial conceptions; of real, actual soul-life

at least approximately—the distinction between the "objective" and the "subjective" in the living man's sensuous perceptions and the same as they appear to the psychic perceptions of a disembodied entity (Devachanee). It will not strengthen his case to put forth the objection that "the mode of the intercourse is not such as we can at present recognize from experience"; in other words, that until one becomes a "Devachanee" one cannot enter into sympathy with his feelings or perceptions. For, the disembodied individuality being identical in nature with the higher *triad* of the living man, when liberated as the result of *self* evolution effected by the full development of conscious and trained will, the adept can through this triad learn all that concerns the Devachanee; live for the time being his mental life, feel as he feels, and sharing thoroughly in his supersensuous perceptions, bring back with him on earth the memory of the same, unwarped by *mayavic* deceptions, hence—not to be gain-said. This, of course, assuming the existence of such *lusus naturæ* as an "adept," which may, perhaps, be conceded by the objectors for the sake of argument. And the further concession must be asked that no comparison shall be made to the adept's detriment between the perceptive powers of his triad, when so freed from the body, and those of the half liberated monad of the entranced somnambule or medium which is having its dazed glimpses into the "celestial arcana." Still less, is it allowable to gauge them by the reveries of an embodied mind, however cultured and metaphysical, which has no data to build upon, save the deductions and inductions which spring from its own normal activity.

However much European students may seem to have outgrown the crude beliefs of their earlier years, yet a special study of Asiatic mental tendencies is indispensable to qualify them to grasp the meaning of Asiatic expressions. In a word, they may have out-grown their hereditary ideas only far enough to qualify them as critics of the same; and not sufficiently to determine what is "inconsistent language" or consistent, of Eastern thinkers. Difference in the resources of language is also a most important factor to keep in mind. This is well illustrated in the alleged reply of an Oriental visiting Europe, when asked to contrast Christianity with

---

—from the occult stand-point. While man is either *dreamlessly*, profoundly asleep or in a trance state, the *triad* (Spirit, Soul and Mind) enters into perfect union with the Paramatma, the Supreme Universal Soul.—*Ed.*

Buddhism: "It requires an Index or glossary; for it (Christianity) has not the ideas for our words, nor the words for our ideas." Every attempt to explain the doctrines of Occultism in the meagre terminology of European science and metaphysics to students ignorant of our terms, is likely to result in disastrous misunderstandings despite good intentions on both sides. Unquestionably, such expressions as "life real in a dream" must appear inconsistent to a dualist who affirms the eternity of the individual soul, its independent existence, as distinct from the Supreme Soul or Paramatma, and maintains the *actuality* of (the personal) God's nature. What more natural than that the Western thinker, whose inferences are drawn from quite a different line of thought, should feel bewilderment when told that the Devachanic life is "reality" —though a dream, while earthly life is but "a flitting dream"— though imagined an actuality. It is certain that Prof. Balfour Stewart—great physicist though he be—would not comprehend the meaning of our Oriental philosophers, since his hypothesis of an unseen universe, with his premises and conclusions, is built upon the emphatic assumption of the actual existence of a personal God, the personal Creator, and personal moral Governor of the Universe. Nor would the Mussulman philosopher with his two eternities—*azl,* that eternity which has no beginning, and *abd,* that other eternity having a beginning but no end; nor the Christian who makes every man's eternity begin (!) at the moment when the personal God breathes a personal soul into the personal body—comprehend us. Neither of these three representatives of belief could, without the greatest difficulty, concur in the perfect reasonableness of the doctrine of Devachanic life.

When the word "subjective" is used in connection with the state of isolation of the Devachanee, it does not stand for the ultimate possible concept of subjectivity, but only for that degree of the same thinkable by the Western *non-Oriental* mind. To the latter everything is subjective without distinction which evades all sensuous perceptions. But the Occultist postulates an ascending scale of subjectivity which grows continually more real as it gets farther and farther from illusionary earthly objectivity: its ultimate, *Reality*—Parabrahm.

But Devachan being "but a dream," we should agree upon a definition of the phenomena of dreams. Has memory any thing to do with them? We are told by some physiologists it has. That

the dream-fancies being based upon dormant memory,[2] are determined and developed in most cases by the functional activity of some internal organ, "the irritation of which awakens into activity that part of the brain with which the organ is in specific sympathy."

To this, bowing reverentially to modern science, the Occultist replies that there are dreams and dreams. That there is a difference between a dream produced by outward physiological causes, and the one which reacts and becomes in its turn the producer of super-sensuous perceptions and feelings. That he divides dream into the phenomenal and the noumenal, and distinguishes between the two; and that, moreover, the physiologist is entirely unfit to comprehend the ultimate constitution of a disembodied *Ego*—hence the nature of *its* "dreams." This, he does for several reasons, of which one may be particularly noticed: the physiologist rejects *a priori* WILL, the chief and indispensable factor of the inner man. He refuses to recognize it apart from particular acts of volition, and declares that he knows only the latter, viewed by him simply as a reaction or desire of determination of energy outward, after . . . "the complex interworking and combination of ideas in the hemispheral ganglia." Hence the physiologist would have to reject at once the possibility of consciousness—*minus* memory; and the Devachanee having no organs, no sensory ganglia, no "educated" nor even "idiotic centres,"[3] nor nerve-cells, cannot naturally have that, what the physiologists would regard and define as memory. Unfettered from the *personal* sensations of the *manas*, the devachanic consciousness would certainly have to become universal or *absolute* consciousness, with no past as with no future, the two merging into one eternal PRESENT—but for the trammels of the personal Ego. But even the latter, once severed from its bodily organs, can have no such memory as defined by Professor Huxley, who fathers it upon the "sensigenous molecules" of the brain—those molecules, which, begotten by sensation, remain behind when it has passed away, and that constitute, we are told, the physical foundation of memory; hence also the foundation of all dreams. What can these molecules have to do with the ethereal atoms that act in the spiritual consciousness of the monad,

---

[2] One of the paradoxes of modern physiology seems to be that "the more sure and perfect memory becomes, the more unconscious it becomes." (See *Body and Mind*, by H. Maudsley, M.D.)

[3] Professor Maudsley's expressions.

during its bliss wholly based and depending upon the degree of its connection with only the *essence* of the personal *Ego!*

What may then be the nature of the Devachanic dream? we are asked—and how does the occultist define the dream of the still embodied man? To Western science a dream is a series of thoughts, of connected acts or rather "states," which are *only imagined to be real.* The uninitiated metaphysician, on the other hand, describes it in his exoteric way, as the passage of sense from darkness into light—the awakening of spiritual consciousness. But the occultist, who knows that the spiritual sense pertaining to the *immutable* can never sleep or even be dormant *per se,* and is always in the "Light" of reality, says that during the state of sleep, *Manas* (the seat of the physical and personal intelligence) becomes able—its containing vehicle *Kama,* the WILL, being allowed the full freedom of its conscious action owing to *volition* being rendered passive, and unconscious by the temporary inactivity of the sensory centres—to perceive that reality in the subjective world which was hidden from it in waking hours. That reality does not become less real, because upon awakening the "sensigenous molecules," and "uneducated centres" throw and toss in the *mayavic* light of actual life the recollection and even the remembrance of it into confusion. But the participation of the *manas* in the Devachanic bliss, does not add to, but on the contrary takes away from, the reality that would fall to the lot of the monad were it altogether free from its presence. Its bliss is an outcome of *Sakkayaditthi,* the delusion or "heresy of individuality," which heresy, together with the *attavadic* chain of causes, is necessary for the monad's future birth. It is all this that leads the occultist to regard the association or "intercourse" between two disembodied entities in the Devachan—however *more real than life* it may be—as an illusion, and from his standpoint still "a dream," and so to speak of it; while that which his critics would fain call—however regretfully—dreams—"the interludes which fancy makes"—is in the knowledge of the former simply glimpses of the Reality.

Let us take an instance: a son loses a much beloved father. In his dreams he may see and converse with him, and for the time it lasts feel as happy and unconscious of his death as though the father had never left this earth. This upon awakening, he will regard with sorrow as a mere dream that could not last. Is he

right to so regard it? The occultist says that he is wrong. He is simply ignorant of the fact that his spirit being of the same essence and nature as that of his father,—as all spirits are—and the inherent property of mutual attraction and assimilation being in their special case strengthened by the paternal and filial love of their personal *Egos*—that they have, in fact, *never separated from each other*, death itself being powerless to sever psychic association there, where pure spiritual love links the two. The "dream" was in this instance *the reality;* the latter a *maya*, a false appearance due to *avidya* (false notions). Thus it becomes more correct and proper to call the son's ignorance during his waking hours a "dream" and "a delusion," than to so characterize the *real* intercourse. For what has happened? A Spiritualist would say: "the spirit of the father *descended* upon earth to hold communion with his son's spirit, during the quiet hours of sleep." The Occultist replies; "Not so; neither the father's *spirit* descended, nor has the son's triad ascended (strictly and correctly speaking)." The centre of Devachanic activity cannot be localized: it is again *avidya*. Monads during that time even when connected with their five finite *Kosas* (sheaths or principles) know neither space nor time, but are diffused throughout the former, are omnipresent and ubiquitous. *Manas* in its higher aspect is *dravya* —an eternal "substance" as well as the *Buddhi*, the spiritual soul —when this aspect is developed; and united with the Soul *Manas* becomes spiritual *self*-consciousness, which is a *Vikara* (a production) of its original "producer" *Buddhi*.[4] Unless made utterly unfit, by its having become hopelessly mixed with, and linked to, its lower *Tanmatras*, to become one with Buddhi, it is inseparable from it. Thus the higher human triad, drawn by its affinity to those triads it loved most, with *Manas* in its highest aspect of self consciousness—(which is entirely disconnected with, and has no need as a channel of the internal organ of physical sense called *antah-karana*)[5]—helping, it is ever associated with, and enjoys the presence of all those it loves—in death, as much as it did in

---

[4] It is only when *Ego* becomes *Ego-ism* deluded into a notion of independent existence as the producer in its turn of the five *Tanmatras* that Manas is considered *Mahabhutic* and finite in the sense of being connected with *Ahancara*, the *personal* "I-creating" faculty. Hence Manas is both eternal and non-eternal: eternal in its atomic nature (*paramanu rupa*), finite (or *karya-rupa*) when linked as a duad—with *Kama* (*Volition*), a lower production.—*Ed.*

[5] *Antah-karana* is the path of communication between soul and body, entirely disconnected with the former: existing with, belonging to, and dying with the body.—*Ed.*

life. The intercourse is *real and genuine.*

The critic doubts whether such an intercourse can be called a "veritable one." He wants to know "whether the two disembodied entities are really and truly affected the one by the other," or, "is it merely that one *imagines* the presence of the other," such intercourse corresponding with no fact "of which the other personality (either embodied or disembodied) could take cognizence"; and while doubting, he denies that he is "postulating an incongruity" in objecting that such an intercourse is *not* real, is a "mere dream," for he says, "he *can* conceive a real intercourse—conscious on both sides and truly acting and reacting which does *not* apply only to the mutual relationship of physical existence." If he really *can,* then where is the difficulty complained of? The real meaning attached by the occultist to such words as dream, reality, and unreality, having been explained, what further trouble is there to comprehend this specific tenet? The critic may also be asked, how he can conceive of a real conscious intercourse on both sides, unless he understands the peculiar, and—to him as yet unknown—intellectual reaction and inter-relation between the two. [This sympathetic reaction is no fanciful hypothesis but a scientific fact known and taught at initiations, though unknown to modern science and but hazily perceived by some metaphysicians—spiritualists.][6] Or is it that, alternatively, he anthropomorphises Spirit—in the spiritualistic mistaken sense? Our critic has just told us that "the mode of the intercourse is not such as we (he) can at present recognize from experience." What kind of intercourse is it then that he *can* conceive of?

---

[6] It is demonstrated to Occultists by the fact that two adepts separated by hundreds of miles, leaving their bodies at their respective habitations *and their astral bodies* (the lower *manas* and volition *kama*) to watch over them, can still meet at some distant place and hold converse and even perceive and sense each other for hours *as though* they were both *personally* and bodily together, whereas, even their lower *mayavi-rupas* are absent.—*Ed.*

letters • questions • comment

What are the implications of the phrase "acquired individuality" in H.P.B.'s statement of the Third Fundamental Proposition in The Secret Doctrine? *In view of the emphasis in Theosophical philosophy on unity—that is, the "fundamental identity of all Souls with the Universal Oversoul, the latter being itself an aspect of the Unknown Root"—the individuality to be acquired is apparently not individual in the sense of being separate. Yet it seems to require separateness in some sense to develop at all.*

"Individuality is a conscious existence in spirit, whether in or out of the body," according to a statement in *Answers to Questions on the Ocean of Theosophy* by Robert Crosbie. Spirit, the root of all beings, is the *power* to be, to know, to do. Soul, also, as the being, knowing and doing, is shared by all beings, for all life, embodied in form, has these powers in varying degree. Thus individuality, in the sense here given it, means awareness of independence of matter rather than of necessary separateness from other beings.

Yet, H.P.B. says in the passage on the First Proposition that pre-Cosmic Substance is essential to manifestation:

> Apart from Cosmic Substance, Cosmic Ideation could not manifest as individual consciousness, since it is only through a vehicle of matter that consciousness wells up as "I am I," a physical basis being necessary to focus a ray of the Universal Mind at a certain stage of complexity. (*S.D.* I, 15.)

How, then, does independence of matter differ from being separate from it? Perhaps the process by which we learn and consolidate skills will serve as an analogy. In the early stages of learning one is apt to be preoccupied with the acquirement of a skill through practice, even identifying oneself as that activity itself. Later, however, with the confidence of mastery, this preoccupation passes; our attention turns to other things. But the possession of the skill remains, to be *used*, now, according to the will of its possessor. In like manner, independence of matter implies, not separateness, but understanding and appropriate use.

The vehicle of matter, in which consciousness wells up as "I am I," makes possible self-consciousness and choice. It is essen-

tially mind which draws together the lower principles from nature and unites a portion of itself with them, so to speak, creating by this incarnation the lower mind. From this standpoint, acquiring individuality in spirit would be the process of outgrowing the lower mind's identification with its sheaths—the personal idea that the "I am I" *is* any of these—and understanding that the vivifying power actually comes from mind in a universal sense—mind able to embrace the universe. This, surely, is a part of what is meant in *The Voice of the Silence* by "living in the eternal."

> For this, thou has to live and breathe in all, as all that thou perceivest breathes in thee; to feel thyself abiding in all things, all things in SELF.

Ecology as a popular movement today expresses much concern for the kingdoms of nature and man's relation to them. But this concern seems largely based on an understanding of nature in physical terms. What is the bearing of the Theosophical teaching of evolution on this idea? What about the hidden impact of man's behavior on nature, for instance?

Man is widely considered an animal—not necessarily bestial or vicious—although to many his "higher" status in the natural order often seems more evident in his capacity to wound and destroy than in achievements such as satellites and sophisticated surgery. And, indeed, most men do seem to spend most of their time acquiring creature comforts, confining their thinking to the level of merely personal consciousness.

But in the Theosophical perspective, nature is consciousness embodied in infinitely varied forms of life—forms shaped by ideas, making them tangible symbols of the universal symmetries of manifested existence. These forms are influenced and affected by the thoughts and acts of men. Man shares in the life and intelligence provided by great nature, adapting both to the complex psychic and physical structures of his own being. But through the uniquely human consciousness that pervades these structures, he is heir to a higher order of intelligence in nature as well. As yet scarcely understood, although partially and vaguely claimed, this higher dimension of man's psychic life has still to be recognized as a part of the noumenal nature in whose subtleties man also shares. Not realizing his obligation to train the lives of the lower kingdoms to a higher sensitivity, he has used his intelligence to dominate and exploit.

In the present travail of our polluted waters and scarred earth, we may see reflected the physical and psychic disorder of our cities, the debasement of our politics, and the poverty of our leisure pursuits. In the widespread concern of the ecology movement we may also recognize an intuitive awareness of a higher knowledge, rightfully man's, that can both restore and elevate. But there is not yet a coherent realization that this knowledge already exists in organized form, with instructions for study and for practical application. Only the few are pursuing this study and work.

Even as we know him, man is not just a higher animal, but so long as he does not claim his birthright by acknowledging the reality of this knowledge, his ecological science will suffer from severe limitations. The wonder is that, even somewhat gropingly, it promises to accomplish so much. Its full potentialities will be revealed when spirit and mind rebecome substantial realities in human thinking. Then Ecology will be understood as man's acknowledgment of responsibility for the evolution of the whole planet. It will be a discipline illuminating and serving psychological as well as physical man and nature.

For man is the microcosm of the macrocosm, not only as a body, but as mind and soul as well. When humans discover in themselves how law operates at the various levels of their own being, and find, reciprocally, the orderly correspondences in nature, the present concern for the earth and its non-human inhabitants will indeed become wonderfully effective in creating a better world.

Spirit is universal. It cannot be said to belong to anything or anybody. It is like the air, universal and everywhere. It cannot know Itself except as Soul. Spirit is the "power to become"; Soul is "the becoming." Spirit is the power to see and know; Soul is the seeing and knowing. Soul is the accumulation of perceptions and experiences by means of which Spiritual Identity is realized.

—ROBERT CROSBIE

REFLECTIONS ON BODIES

THE sheaths of the soul are described by Mr. Judge as the means by which the ego experiences Nature. They are necessary as foci of both sensations and ideas, the materials the soul transforms into knowledge. This process is reciprocal, from within outwards and from objective to subjective, for "man is made up of millions of lives, and from these, unable of themselves to act rationally or independently, he gains ideas, and as master of all puts those ideas, together with others from higher planes into thought, word and act." ("Mesmerism," THEOSOPHY I:188.)

Further:

> This Soul is not only on its way upward for itself, but is compelled at the same time to draw up, refine, purge and perfect the gross matter—so-called—in which it is compelled to live. For though we call the less fine stages of substance by the name "matter," it is, however, made up of lives which have in them the potentiality of becoming Souls in the enormously distant future; and the Soul being itself a life made up of smaller ones, it is under the brotherly necessity of waiting in the bonds of matter long enough to give the latter the right impetus along the path of perfection. ("The Sheaths of the Soul," THEOSOPHY, I:221.)

Quite evidently, the materials or "lives" composing the sheaths which make the field of our inner life are also drawn from the reservoir of nature—nature conceived as a vast hierarchy of degrees of intelligence as well as form. If these materials—the stuff of past thoughts, feelings, acts, habits—are stamped with the intentions of the higher mind, they serve the growth processes of the ego. If not, they make confinements and blocks to progress. Yet there is a sense in which all things brought forward from the past have their utility, since they represent unfinished business—lessons not yet learned, incompleted projects, barriers still unpenetrated. The soul's "present" is made of these materials, now available for assimilation into knowledge, just as the acquisitions of childhood experience are partly outgrown but also partly incorporated into our larger capacity of responding to the circumstances and events of life.

When the ego, as a deliberately purposive being, gives attention to the course of daily life, the reflexes of merely habitual response are replaced by conscious widening of the field of experience and understanding. Duty becomes more than moral obligation, being transformed into egoic opportunity eagerly undertaken. The flow of thought is now naturally creative, the mind becoming the field and matrix of the re-creative program of life. Motive is the directing force, for motive determines the quality and alliances of thought. Study reinforces motive with increased understanding, bringing into awareness vistas of human possibility which inspire and attract.

The bodies that we have made—the sheaths of the soul—are both the means of our growth and the raw material of universal evolution, the life to be raised to a higher level of being.

IDEATION

Pythagoras brought his doctrines from the eastern sanctuaries, and Plato compiled them into a form more intelligible than the mysterious numerals of the Sage—whose doctrines he had fully embraced—to the uninitiated mind. Thus, the Kosmos is "the Son" with Plato, having for his father and mother the divine Thought and Matter. The "Primal Being" (*Beings*, with the Theosophists, as they are the collective aggregation of the divine Rays), is an emanation of the Demiurgic or Universal Mind which contains from eternity the idea of the "to be created world" within itself, which idea the unmanifested LOGOS produces of Itself. The first Idea "born in darkness before the creation of the world" remains in the unmanifested Mind; the second is this Idea going out as a reflection from the Mind (now the manifested LOGOS), becoming clothed with matter, and assuming an objective existence.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

on the lookout

Good Teachers Are Needed

While the controversy over Darwinism and materialism in the schools will doubtless go on and on, since settlement of such issues lies not with final answers but with human maturity, reduction of the heat and anger in this struggle, along with some give and take in attitudes, would result from the decentralization of education and a more regional or even local source of study materials. Science, after all, is a changing thing, and while pupils can survive misconception or technical inaccuracy, they find it difficult to overcome the mediocrity of the weasel words of compromise composition. A high school class studying mankind would be helped far more by reading, say, Tom Bethell's article in last February *Harper's* in which he says, "Darwin made a mistake," and that his theory of natural selection is "in process of being discarded," although "with a minimum of publicity," than by being exposed to "equal time" giving the fundamentalist church view of these matters. Teachers, but not educational systems, are able to include such material in classroom activities.

The Selfish Self

Harper's for April has a defense of the family and of family life by Michael Novak that deserves attention. While Mr. Novak writes from a religious background, much of his criticism has a searching, philosophical quality. In one place he says:

> We lack the courage nowadays to live by our creeds, or to state our doctrines clearly (even to ourselves). Our highest moral principle is flexibiiity. Guided by sentiments we are embarrassed to put into words, we support them not by argument but by their trendiness.
>
> The central idea of our foggy way of life, however, seems unambiguous enough. It is that life is solitary and brief, and that its aim is self-fulfillment. Next come beliefs in establishing the imperium of the self. Total mastery over one's surroundings, control over the disposition of one's time—these are the

necessary conditions for self-fulfillment. ("Stand not in my way.") Autonomy we understand to mean protection of our inner kingdom—protection around the self from intrusions of chance, irrationality, necessity, and other persons. ("My self, my castle.") In such a vision of the self, marriage is merely an alliance. It entails as minimal an abridgment of inner privacy as one partner or the other will allow. Children are not a welcome responsibility, for to have children is, plainly, to cease being a child oneself.

On Growing Up

This muscular criticism recalls the candid and revealing report of Donald Pellman, a highschool teacher who, with his wife and baby, bought thirty acres in Vermont and moved to that unproductive country to live on the land and experience a "natural life." He was not as handy with tools as some of his neighbors, and minor and major disasters overtook him at regular intervals. Finally, two years later, he and his wife took stock and decided that while they were going to *stay* in Vermont, they would go back to callings they knew more about—he would write (which he does well) and she would weave (which she does well). These are background facts. The important part of his article (in the *New York Times Magazine*, Feb. 29) reports a conversation with a friend:

> David and I have talked our obsession with rural life into the ground, but somehow in every discussion he opens up a new perspective on the subject. "The trouble with all of us," he said the other day, "is that we're too preoccupied with ourselves, with figuring out who we are." . . .
>
> The obsession with defining myself, the new realization of how much I depended on other people, the new awareness of what things really cost, the necessity of proving myself, the romantic posturing and even the cynicism all added up to one thing—adolescence! By trying to start out in a new direction, I had in effect become an adolescent.

This article, one might say, is an encouraging report on growing up.

Knowing "the Self"

There are numerous other signs of this "growing up." Tracing the manifestations of the idea of brotherhood in American history, starting with the early days of the republic, and examining the stultifying effects of individualism and the goal of private acquisition, through the years, on this moral ideal, Wilson Carey

McWilliams, in *The Idea of Fraternity in America* (University of California Press, 1973), voices a conception of self-realization which now has expression in many quarters. He says:

> To know the self is to know the whole of which the self is a part; to know identity, one must know the self not only at a given time, but the self over time, something which man cannot "know" until the end. Man's foreknowledge of death, in fact, always wars with his desire for survival until eros finally surrenders its effort to deny death's reality in the moment of experiencing it. The only complete moment of identity is the moment of extinction. Fraternal relations do not reveal identity to the individual: they provide him the assurance of identity which is necessary for him to seek to know its nature.

Platonic Goal

> Man is never assured of identity except in relation to others. . . . In one sense, the law of life is the law of differentiation, the quest for identity; in another, it is the law of likeness. Men may feel that the loss of their illusions of unity and identity, which began with the child's sense of oneness, is the barring of a door which shuts them out of home. But if the kindreds of man have done their task of strengthening the individual, he will feel the change to be the result of his opening the gates which shut him in. Alienation is not involuntary exile. It is not the loss of an old home so much as the finding of a new patria which makes the old, valued as it may be in its own way, seem less excellent, less truly "mine."
>
> If ego motives become increasingly dominant, life is a process in which eros, gradually losing capacity for delight in the world of sense, loses its hostility to thanatos, a "learning how to die" that may be the only means to genuine identity. Death is the supreme moment of human independence, yet it is also the moment at which men are most alike and akin. Then all the bizarre garbs, the kaleidoscopic costumes of the ages and the nations and clans and classes, are swept away. All the panoply of illusion men use to brighten life and darken the blaze of truth—necessary, as Plato knew, if they are to bear it at all—pass, and man is one with man.

Attitude Toward Work

The philosophic assumptions behind such thinking are obvious enough, needing only the doctrines of Karma and Reincarnation to supply the sustaining strength that practical application of them will require. A similar spirit, although embodied in other ideas and words, seems implicit in passages in another remarkable book of recent publication—*The New American Ideology*

(Knopf) by George Cabot Lodge. This professor of business administration at the Harvard School of Business is convinced that the acquisitive motives of industry and commerce must now give way to a communitarian mode of life and enterprise. Speaking of the change in attitudes, especially among the young, he says:

> The problem does not lie with work or authority per se . . . but rather with the purpose and meaning of work, the legitimacy of authority, and the possibility of self-respect within the work context. Whereas once self-respect could be had within the bounds of traditional individualism and its conceptions of autonomous man, this is no longer the case. Self-respect lies in one's relationship to a whole; work within that relationship is inseparable from it. Incentives have also changed. Money and matter are still unquestionably incentives, but with the coming of the communitarian right to income and survival, both have lost some of their force.

Lack of Guidance

> The monumental problem confronting young people—as well as the not-so-young—is that there is no clear ideological delineation within which they can understand this transition. Young people, for example, tend to hanker after the traditional notion of individualism. Sometimes they go to absurd or even suicidal lengths to recover it. At the same time, they feel the need for new, communitarian norms to govern income distribution, inheritances, health care, and so on. They feel, but cannot quite comprehend, the contradiction between these two drives. Neither schools, parents, business, nor the political order are very helpful in explaining this transition or in teaching the way to adaptation. The result is too often a turning off or inward, a self-centeredness conditioned by the sense of futility and powerlessness to change. They withdraw from that which they cannot affect.

Ecological Concern and Brotherhood

The present awakening, as Prof. Lodge sees it, takes the form of a movement toward community:

> Increasingly, individuals are being forced to renounce their private interests and to subordinate themselves to the interests of larger social units. . . . Two ethics emerge: an ecological ethic, which is necessary if man is to avoid destruction of the fragile biosphere within which he is encased; and a self-realization or self-fulfillment ethic, which allows each human being to develop his vital powers to the fullest extent. The two must be combined. . . . Both take us back to the spirit of early Judeo-Christian thought and to Eastern concepts of the oneness of the

human race and the harmony of man in communion with nature.

Stages of Growth

There is striking presence of such themes in a number of present-day discussions. In the spring *Daedalus* Erik Erikson develops an application of his theory of life-stages to Ingmar Bergman's film, *Wild Strawberries,* drawing certain general conclusions at the end:

> . . . there seem to be two poles to human endeavor, namely the felt necessity to "survive and kill" where both the territorial survival and the cultural identity of a human subspecies seem to depend upon the defensive or offensive exclusion of (all) others; and the precept "die and become" where, on the contrary, ascetic self-denial to the point of self-sacrifice appears to be the only means to becoming more inclusively human. . . . For whatever chance man has to transcend the limitations of his self seems to depend on his full (if often tragic) engagement in the one and only life cycle permitted to him. By the same token, a civilization and its belief systems can be measured by the meaning they give to the full cycle of life, for such meaning (or the lack of it) cannot fail to reach into the beginnings of future generations.
>
> All this was assumed when I came to the formulation that *Wisdom,* in whatever systematic or implicit, eloquent or quiet way it may be expressed, *is the detached and active concern with life itself in the face of death itself, and that it maintains and conveys the integrity of experience, in spite of the decline of bodily and mental functions.*

Fellowship Displaces Self-Absorption

In summation, Dr. Erikson speaks of the three stages of adulthood proper:

> They first emerge when a person is ready to commit his strengths, which have matured earlier, to the "maintenance of the world" in historical space and time. They must now combine in mature love, which arises from the crisis of Intimacy versus Isolation, and in the quality of Care, which, in turn, emerges from the crisis of Generativity versus Self-Absorption. *Love,* as I have postulated, *is mutuality of devotion forever subduing the antagonisms inherent in divided function.* It pervades the intimacy of individuals, and it is thus the basis of ethical concern. . . . *Fidelity is the ability to sustain loyalties freely pledged in spite of the inevitable contradictions and confusions of value systems.* It is the cornerstone of identity, and it receives inspiration from confirming ideologies and affirming companions.

Finally, Dr. Erikson speaks of the relativity of these cycles, implying that individuals go through the phases of psycho-moral development again and again, at different levels. This would apply to repeated cycles within a single lifetime, and also to the differing circumstances of successive incarnations, of which possibility Dr. Erikson is by no means ignorant, since in *Gandhi's Truth* he speaks of the parallel between the life-stages of his psychology of development and the ancient Indian scheme (more or less as given in the *Path* article, "Living the Higher Life"), noting in particular that reincarnation affords repeated and better opportunities for learning and growth.

Introspection in Human Science

In her address as retiring President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (printed in *Science* for March 5), Margaret Mead, a well-known cultural anthropologist who teaches at Columbia University, stressed the need of scientists to recognize that the scientific method must have two sides, not one. Drawing on work by two of her predecessors in office as president of the AAAS, Franz Boas and Warren Weaver, she showed that the study of Man requires a broader view of scientific method than that of the physical sciences. She said:

> As a first step in this direction I suggest that it is necessary to recognize that our knowledge of ourselves and of the universe within which we live comes not from a single source but, instead, from two sources—from our capacity to explore human responses to events in which we and others participate through introspection and empathy, as well as from our capacity to make objective observations on physical and animate nature.
>
> It is also necessary to recognize that the inappropriate extension into the physical world of human beings' understanding of themselves harms rather than enhances the development of the kind of objective understanding that we call science. Equally we must now come to realize that the extension into the human world of the methods of the physical sciences can be stultifying and dangerous. . . . disciplined introspection and empathy are essential to the study of the unique characteristics of humankind.

Need for Self-Awareness

This recognition of the vital importance of subjectivity in the study of human beings has been long in coming, but seems now well established even in the middle-of-the-road outlook of the

social and cultural sciences. Dr. Mead puts the obligation clearly: "The human scientist has had to learn how to relate self-knowledge of him- or herself as a multisensory being with a unique personal history as a member of a specific culture at a specific period to ongoing experience and how to include as far as possible this disciplined self-awareness in observations on other lives and in other cultures." Much, of course, depends upon the way in which the investigator's self-awareness is used, and what he or she is attempting to find out. It is difficult to see how any subjectivity was employed in putting together an educational program concerning human beings which was the subject of controversy a few years ago.

The "Humanness" of Human Beings?

This program is described in the April *Scientific American* by Dorothy Nelkin:

> The development of the social-science curriculum, titled *Man: A Course of Study* (MACOS), was launched in 1963 when a group of scholars from the Education Development Center, Inc. (then Educational Services, Inc.) of Cambridge, Mass., received a grant from the National Science Foundation to develop an integrated program of precollege social-science courses. Until MACOS was introduced the teaching of social science in the public schools had consisted mostly of descriptive presentations of American history. MACOS, designed for children in the fifth and sixth grades, asks three questions: What is human about human beings? How did they get that way? How can they become more so?
>
> The MACOS curriculum relies on studies of animal behavior and of the culture of the Netsilik Eskimos to explore questions about the nature of human beings, patterns of social interaction and child rearing, and the development of a culture's total view of the world. To the social scientists who worked on the MACOS curriculum the study of animal behavior provided a provocative metaphor to illuminate features of human behavior. The study of traditional tribal culture showed how human beings as well as animals adapt to a particular environment; in order for the Netsilik to survive in an environment with limited food resources they practice infanticide and senilicide as means of controlling the population. MACOS suggested that in some societies such practices, disturbing as they would be in our own culture, were functional, and that neither behavior nor beliefs have an absolute value apart from their social and physical context.

Eskimo Character

Whatever the virtues of this program—and from Dorothy Nelkin's description they do not seem numerous—one is led to wonder why, if humans were to be set off from animals in this course, the anthropologists did not work in such things as Stefansson's account of the Coronation Gulf Eskimos, with whom he lived for years:

> In the Stone Age community those who were selfish lost standing. Those who were altruistic rose in the public esteem. A man who got things to use them himself was not frowned on so long as everybody felt that what he was using was not beyond his needs; but whenever anyone began to keep for himself more than by the usual experience was necessary for his comfort, he lost some of the community's good opinion; if he gave the impression that his main purpose for getting things was that he wanted to keep them, then he fell in standing rapidly. However, the situation never went that far, in my experience, for I never actually knew anybody who had the "moral" courage to persist in the acquisitive type of unsocial conduct.

Distorted "Image" of Man

One could say that quite evidently Darwinian "objectivity" pervaded the thinking of the social scientists who planned the MACOS course. It seems to suggest mainly that humans are only a special sort of animal with some distinctive devices for physical survival. The evidence for this may have a limited importance—and the matter of the practice of infanticide may have a place somewhere in the curriculum for mature students—but for the fifth or sixth grade, one would think another sort of material would be educationally far more intelligent. Being shaped, supposedly, by such a course are the conceptions of ten-year-olds concerning the nature of human beings, and it should be borne in mind that the way people think of themselves and one another does indeed have an effect on their moral decisions. Thus "human scientists" have large responsibilities. Studies which isolate behavior in humans which is comparable to that of animals may leave out a whole range of traits and characteristics which are not animal-like at all—ennobling qualities to which the young can relate with a degree of enthusiasm, and perhaps emulation. The point of the critics of this program, who were numerous, was that the emulation of what it stressed in Eskimo behavior is hardly desir-

able; and, as the authors of the course point out, by no means relevant to the lives and needs of American children.

Fundamentalist Objections

Unfortunately, the critics of MACOS who made their influence felt through vocal objections to the course, leading to its suspension, were mostly spokesmen for the fundamentalist branches of Christianity, who "are particularly distressed by the teachings of modern biology and social science because of the emphasis in the similarities between man and other animals, because of the implication that moral values are relative and because of the denial that an omnipotent and omniscient force determines human development and behavior." They argue, further, that "emphasizing the genetic similarities between human beings and other animals may encourage 'animal-like,' socially dangerous behavior." It is by no means necessary—and indeed rather ridiculous—to claim "omniscient" supervision of human development in objecting to the low-grade conception of man which an exclusively biological emphasis, or even excessive preoccupation with social conditioning, generates for students. Actually, balanced accounts of the basic attitudes toward life among the tribes and primitive peoples of the past exist in anthropological literature and could be used to advantage in such programs.

A Pantheist Mood

For example, in *The Primitive World and its Transformations,* Robert Redfield says:

> Primitive man is at once in nature and yet acting on it, getting his living, taking from it food and shelter. But as that nature is part of the same moral system in which man and the affairs between men also find themselves, man's actions with regard to nature are limited by notions of inherent, not expediential rightness. Even the practical, little-animistic Eskimo obey many exacting food taboos, religious restrictions on practical activity; rituals of propitiation or personal adjustments to field or forest, abound in ethnological literature. "All economic activities, such as hunting, gathering fuel, cultivating the land, storing food, assume a relatedness to the encompassing universe." And the relatedness is moral and religious.

Wide Spectrum of Criticism

If those who prepare material for use in the schools were more inclined to use sources of this sort, they would be less open to

the attacks of fundamentalist critics, who have growing power these days, especially in California and certain Southern states. It is the almost total neglect of man as a moral as well as a physical being that exposes scientific education to the charge of materialism and of being an "amoral" influence in education. Actually the conflict over the science textbooks in the schools—recently a heated controversy in California—has roots much deeper than mere religious bigotry. As Dorothy Nelkin says in her *Scientific American* article:

> It is easy to label those who question the validity and limits of modern science as ignorant, irrational or crackpot. Those labels throw no light at all on the social and political tensions that sustain objections to the teaching of science in the public schools. First, the protests reflect the fact that a non-negligible fraction of the population is disillusioned with science and is concerned that it threatens traditional religious and moral values. Second, the protests reflect the fact that many people clearly resent the authority represented by scientific dogmatism, particularly when that authority is expressed in increased professionalism of the school science curriculum. . . . From the professional perspective designing a school curriculum is a technical enterprise that is best organized by experts, so that the curricula will provide the student with the best available information. Since such values and beliefs are very much family matters, parents must be involved. Clearly science education is no longer exempt from that perspective.

"Scientific Fundamentalism"

It is heartening to find thoughtful discussion of this sort in the pages of the *Scientific American*. This writer goes on to point out that the self-questioning and doubts of the original scientific theorists are subdued or suppressed when their findings are codified and stepped-down for textbook publication. "In the process of simplifying concepts, findings may become explanations, explanations may become axioms and tentative judgments may become definitive conclusions. Few textbooks are careful to stress the distinction between fact and interpretation or to suggest that intuition and speculation guide the development of scientific concepts." Moreover:

> Authoritarian public representations of science are reinforced by scientists who deeply desire to avoid challenge and criticism from people outside their own profession. They tend to respond to criticism with a kind of scientific fundamentalism: by citing the value-free character of their work or the weight of factual evidence that supports their conclusions.